

Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Renner Otto Boisselle & Sklar LLP 1621 Euclid Avenue Nineteenth Floor Cleveland, OH 44115

In re Application of FRAMPTON et al.

U.S. Application No.: 10/507,278

PCT No.: PCT/GB03/00942 Int. Filing Date: 06 March 2003

Priority Date: 13 March 2002

Attorney Docket No.: DYOUP0277US

For: FABRICATION OF

MICROSTRUCTURED OPTICAL

FIBRE

DECISION ON PETITION UNDER 37 CFR 1.47(a)

This decision is in response to applicants' "Petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a)" filed 01 August 2005 to accept the application without the signature of joint-inventor, Kai Ming Kiang. The \$200 petition fee will be charged to Deposit Account no. 18-0988.

BACKGROUND

On 06 March 2003, applicants filed international application PCT/GB03/00942 which claimed a priority date of 13 March 2002. A copy of the international application was communicated to the United States Patent and Trademark Office from the International Bureau on 25 September 2003. Pursuant to 37 CFR 1.495, the thirty-month period for paying the basic national fee in the United States expired at midnight on 13 September 2004.

On 10 September 2004, applicants filed a transmittal letter for entry into the national stage in the United States, which accompanied by, inter alia: the requisite basic national fee as required by 35 U.S.C. 371(c)(1); a copy of the international application; and a preliminary amendment.

On 28 February 2005, the United Stated Designated/Elected Office mailed a Notification of Missing Requirements under 35 U.S.C. 371 (Form PCT/DO/EO/905) indicating that an oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.497(a) and (b) must be filed. The notification set a two-month time limit in which to respond.

On 01 August 2005, applicants filed the present petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a).

2

Application No.: 10/507,278

DISCUSSION

A petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) must be accompanied by (1) the fee under 37 CFR 1.17(h), (2) factual proof that the missing joint inventor refuses to execute the application or cannot be reached after diligent effort, (3) a statement of the last known address of the missing inventor, and (4) an oath or declaration by each 37 CFR 1.47(a) applicant on his or her own behalf and behalf of the non-signing joint inventor. Item (1); (3); and (4) have been satisfied.

Regarding item (2) above, petitioner states that Kai Ming Kiang has refused to sign the application. Section 409.03(d) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.). **Proof of Unavailability or Refusal**, states, in part:

> Where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, the circumstances of the presentation of the application papers and of the refusal must be specified in a statement of facts by the person who presented the inventor with the application papers and/or to whom the refusal was made. Statements by a party not present when an oral refusal is made will not be accepted.

> Proof that a bona fide attempt was made to present a copy of the application papers (specification, including claims, drawings, and oath or declaration) to the nonsigning inventor for signature, but the inventor refused to accept delivery of the papers or expressly stated that the application papers should not be sent, may be sufficient. When there is an express oral refusal, that fact along with the time and place of the refusal must be stated in the statement of facts. When there is an express written refusal, a copy of the document evidencing that refusal must be made part of the statement of facts. The document may be redacted to remove material not related to the inventor's reasons for refusal.

> When it is concluded by the 37 CFR 1.47 applicant that a nonsigning inventor's conduct constitutes a refusal, all facts upon which that conclusion is based should be stated in the statement of facts in support of the petition or directly in the petition. If there is documentary evidence to support facts alleged in the petition or in any statement of facts, such evidence should be submitted. Whenever a nonsigning inventor gives a reason for refusing to sign the application oath or declaration, that reason should be stated in the petition.

Petitioner states that Kai Ming Kiang has refused to sign the application. A review of the present petition and the accompanying papers reveals that applicants have not satisfied item (2) above, in that the applicants have not shown that a bona fide attempt was made to present the application papers to Kai Ming Kiang. The Declaration of Don W. Bulson states that a copy of the application papers were sent (via electronic mail) to Kai Ming Kiang on July 12, 2005. A copy of the cover letter has been provided. However,

3

petitioner fails to include evidence to demonstrate that the materials were actually received by the nonsigning inventor at his last known address. Where the Office is being asked to accept the silence of the nonsigning inventor as evidence of a refusal to sign, petitioner must provide some evidence that the application materials have been received by the nonsigning applicant.

As stated above, where a refusal of the inventor to sign the application papers is alleged, a statement of facts is needed from a person having first hand knowledge of the facts that a complete copy of the application papers (specification, claims, and drawings) were sent to Kai Ming Kiang, and when such papers were sent. In addition, copies of documentary evidence such as a certified mail return receipt, cover letter of instruction, telegrams, etc., should be supplied with the declaration.

CONCLUSION

The petition under 37 CFR 1.47(a) is **DISMISSED** without prejudice.

If reconsideration on the merits of this petition is desired, a proper response must be filed within **TWO (2) MONTHS** from the mail date of this decision. Any reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition Under 37 CFR 1.47(a)." No additional petition fee is required.

Any further correspondence with respect to this matter should be addressed to: Mail Stop PCT, Commissioner for Patents, Office of PCT Legal Administration, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450, with the contents of the letter marked to the attention of the Office of PCT Legal Administration.

Anthony Smith

Attorney-Advisor

Office of PCT Legal Administration

Tel: (571) 272·3298 Fax: (571) 273·0459

fakeouy Smith